From: Edwin Lopacki - WPIB
To: Kevin Kampschroer - M1G
Cc: Philip Mudd
Subject: Re: 888 Up-Frount lighting audit
Date: Thursday, January 28, 2016 8:51:30 AM

Kevin - thanks. We are waiting ot here from you.

On Thu, Jan 28, 2016 at 8:35 AM, Kevin Kampschroer - M1G <kevin.kampschroer@gsa.gov> wrote:

> I have got the best group together to try to figure out a solution on Friday (I'm out of town today). I'll write back after our discussion b
>
> Kevin Kampschroer
> GSA Chief Sustainability Officer
> Federal Director
> Office of Federal High-Performance Green Buildings (MG)
> Office of Government-wide Policy
> US General Services Administration
> 1800 F Street, NW
> Washington, DC. 20405
> (202) 365-5880
>
> On Jan 19, 2016, at 2:15 PM, Edwin Lopacki - WPIB <tony.lopacki@gsa.gov> wrote:
>
>> Kevin, we need your help. We are trying to capture the savings that we expect to realize in the coming interior renovation (about 500K SF)at FERC that includes changing the light florescent light fixtures to LED fixtures. The lessor has not been of much help. What has GSA been able to do in the lease to capture these projected energy savings. FERC does not want to pay the electric bills separately. They want the electric bills to stay in the lease as they are currently.
>>
>> I have included an email string and 6 attachments to catch you up to the history of this issue.
>>
>> Thanks for any help you can give us.
>>
>> ---------- Forwarded message ----------
>> From: **Philip Mudd** <Philip.Mudd@ferc.gov>
>> Date: Fri, Jan 15, 2016 at 7:55 PM
>> Subject: 888 Up-Frount lighting audit
>> To: "tony.lopacki@gsa.gov" <tony.lopacki@gsa.gov>
>> Cc: Joshua Hill <Joshua.Hill@ferc.gov>
>>
>> Tony

Per your request

We can't realize any energy savings benefits without doing an audit up front. Not only that, we will have the same experience we had with **Tishman Speyer** or worse, that we agreed to pay for all of the LEED build-out yet FERC receive now benefit from the energy savings, even though the 1100 Lease called for the 2x4 troffers and 50 ft candles. FERC not only receives no return on investment, we have to fix the LEED lighting when it breaks. And because it was first generation technology, it breaks fairly often and the warranty for First Gen was shorter than the new lighting.

This Lessor however is most likely to ask for an Equitable adjustment 30 days after they deliver the first floor of Project 888, requesting for an increase to annual operating expenses to pay for maintenance on the new lighting system that is likely to bring electric costs down by 75%

GSA's **Kevin Kampschroer**, Director of the Office of Federal High-Performance Green Buildings (OFHPGB) within the office of Government wide Policy (OGP) at the General Services Administration commissioned Philips lighting to do the report in the first attachment.

kevin.kampschroer@gsa.gov

Work: 202-501-4411

Josh as you are aware, the government can't mitigate the incoming Requests for Reasonable Adjustment to the Annual Operating Cost with regard the new lighting plant without first submitting to a proper base- line audit of the existing lighting fixtures & motion detectors. This audit would most likely require the documents the Lessor has provided us on the buildings energy consumption. An acquaintance of mine George L. Borgh with the Public

Segment Programs at **Philips Lighting Systems and Services** told me that the GPG-024 August 2015 that was put out by GSA's Kevin Kampschroer which shows the kind of payback that can come from LED Fixtures with integrated advanced lighting controls, and that they dynamically determine light levels using onboard occupancy and daylight sensors. New plug-and-play fixtures installed at the Ralph H. Metcalfe Federal Building in Chicago and the Peachtree Summit Federal Building in Atlanta maintained lighting quality, **achieved lighting energy savings of 69%** over **the GSA average, and yielded a 40% return on investment.**

We can't realize any energy savings benefits without doing an audit up front. We already have the experience with **Tishman Speyer** that we agreed to pay for all of the LEED build-out yet FERC receive now benefit from the energy savings, even though the 1100 Lease called for the 2x4 troffers and 50 ft candles. FERC not only receives no return on investment, we have to fix the LEED lighting when it breaks. And because it was first generation technology, it breaks fairly often and the warranty for First Gen was shorter than the new lighting.

According to George at **Philips Lighting Systems,** these big lighting projects base line audits are paid for through the lighting contract for the new build out

Kevin Kampschroer,

Director of the Office of Federal High-Performance Green Buildings (OFHPGB)

within the office of Government wide Policy (OGP) at the General Services Administration

kevin.kampschroer@gsa.gov

Work: 202-501-4411

<image001.png>

--
E Tony Lopacki

<GSA Findings GPG-024 AUGUST 2015-_LED_Integrated_with_ALC.pdf>

<SOW for Lighting Audit8_28_2015.docx>

<FERC Electrical usage 1996.-2014.pdf>

<equitable adjustments.pdf>

<SLA #4.pdf>

<SLA#29.pdf>

--
E Tony Lopacki